

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7977

was authorized. The Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed memorial was rejected and returned to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission for further study. The subcommittee favorably reported resolutions providing for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, and Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, and the appointment of William A. M. Burden as citizen regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The group favorably reported a bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, and a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. A resolution was approved authorizing Arizona to place a statue of Father Kino in Statuary Hall. A bill to amend the act relating to the microfilming of Presidential papers was approved; also a bill to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional material for blind persons. Among Senate proposals acted upon by the subcommittee were a bill to provide for indexing and microfilming records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress, and a bill to raise the limitation of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress.

While joint committees do not handle legislation, members of the Committee on House Administration who sit on the Joint Committee on Printing, the Joint Committee on the Library, and the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers, were active in their respective fields.

### Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CHET HOLIFIELD**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, October 13, 1962*

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to present a summary of the activities of the committee in the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This committee, consisting of nine Members from each House, is unique in several respects. It is the only joint committee with the legislative functions of initiating, reviewing, and reporting bills. In addition the committee has conscientiously fulfilled its statutory responsibility as watchdog of AEC and Defense Department secret activities with respect to nuclear weapons and military propulsion. Of equal importance have been its activities in encouraging the peaceful uses of atomic energy through hearings and other public informational activities.

Through these activities, the Joint Committee, as the representative of Congress and the public, has exercised a creative role in initiating and recommending policies and programs to accel-

erate the progress of the atomic energy program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following statement of accomplishments and activities demonstrates the usefulness and vigor of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I look forward to new achievements in the 88th Congress, as the Joint Committee moves into its 17th year of active participation in the atomic energy program.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE  
87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1962

#### I. LEGISLATION

A. AEC AUTHORIZATION BILL (PUBLIC LAW  
NO. 87-701)

The Joint Committee, after hearings in April and May, 1962, reported out the AEC authorization bill for fiscal year 1963—H.R. 11974—on June 21, 1962. The bill authorized a total of \$159,415,000 for new construction projects by the Atomic Energy Commission during fiscal year 1963, and an additional \$3 million for use in the program to develop atomic power in cooperation with private industry. This \$3 million authorization could be used, in addition to other funds previously authorized for a new type of design assistance as requested by AEC, intended to stimulate construction by industry of atomic powerplants of at least 400,000 electrical kilowatt capacity. The bill also authorized the sum of \$5 million, in addition to the \$10 million previously authorized, for use in the cooperative program for research and development with the European Atomic Energy Community.

Among the highlights of section 101 of the bill was a \$10 million authorization for Project Rover—the nuclear powered rocket—test facilities and a \$20 million authorization for an organic reactor project.

Two projects in section 101 of the bill were especially added by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in order to expedite the AEC food irradiation program: a marine products development irradiator, \$600,000; and two mobile irradiators, \$700,000. These projects were added as a result of technical data developed during hearings in February 1962 by the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation on the AEC and Army food irradiation programs.

As reported out by the committee, the bill contained no provision for construction or operation of electric generating facilities at the Hanford new production reactor. The AEC had been negotiating arrangements with the Washington Public Power Supply System, under which WPPSS would construct such generating facilities at its own expense. It had been the view of the parties that congressional authorization would not be necessary in order for AEC to proceed with such arrangements. However, on July 6, 1962, the Comptroller General rendered an opinion that AEC could not proceed with these arrangements without further congressional authorization.

In order to decide as to an appropriate course of action, the Joint Committee held 2 days of hearings on July 10 and 11, to thoroughly review the proposed

arrangements. The hearings were immediately published along with a Joint Committee print containing all the contracts, opinions, and other documents pertinent to a consideration of the WPPSS proposal. After further consideration, the committee voted to report favorably two amendments to the bill authorizing the AEC to proceed with the arrangements under certain conditions.

On July 17, 1962, the House considered the bill and passed it in the form recommended by the Joint Committee, but adopted a substitute amendment in lieu of the Joint Committee's amendments on the WPPSS proposal. The substitute stated that the Commission was not authorized to proceed with any arrangements for construction or operation of electric generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford new production reactor.

The Senate considered the bill on August 1, 1962, and passed it with an amendment offered by Senator JACKSON identical to the two amendments recommended by the Joint Committee. As amended by the Senate, the bill provided that the Commission was authorized to enter into arrangements with non-Federal entities for the construction and operation of electrical energy generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford new production reactor in accordance with specified program justification data which had been previously submitted by the AEC to the Joint Committee, and considered during the hearings. The Senate amendment also contained three provisos, including one that 50 percent of the electrical output would be offered to public organizations and 50 percent to private organizations on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The House considered the bill again on August 29, 1962, and rejected a motion to instruct the conferees to insist on their disagreement with the Senate amendment. Accordingly, a conference committee was convened on September 10, 1962. The conferees filed their report on September 11, 1962. The conference report—House Report No. 2342—provided that the Commission was not authorized to enter into arrangements for the Hanford electric plant unless and until it made a series of determinations concerning the benefits, the national defense aspects, and the costs associated with construction and operation of the project. The conference report also contained a provision that 50 percent participation should be offered to private organizations, and an additional provision for review by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy prior to consummation of any arrangements.

The House considered the conference report on September 14, 1962, and approved it. On September 18, 1962, the Senate considered the conference report and voted its approval.

The bill was forwarded to the President and signed into law on September 26, 1962, as Public Law No. 87-701. Following the enactment of the law, the Joint Committee held further hearings on the proposed arrangements for the

A7978

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 2

Hanford generating facilities. These hearings are described in section III-K of this report.

B. AEC OMNIBUS BILL, 1962 (PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-615)

In accordance with its regular practice, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considered and reported out an omnibus bill incorporating necessary amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In this way the committee assures that the basic legislation reflects any new developments in the atomic energy field.

At the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Joint Committee had pending before it two important bills affecting the regulatory and indemnity sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. These were H.R. 9244, introduced by Congressman PRICE, concerning indemnity matters, and H.R. 3708 and S. 2419, introduced by Chairman HOLIFIELD and Vice Chairman PASTORE concerning regulatory matters. These bills served as a basis for hearings by the Joint Committee on indemnity and regulatory matters in April.

After further study and revisions of the earlier bills, Chairman HOLIFIELD and Vice Chairman PASTORE introduced clean bills, H.R. 12336 and S. 3491, on June 26 and 29, respectively. The bill was passed by the Senate on August 7, 1962, and by the House of Representatives on August 15, 1962. It was approved by the President on August 29, 1962, as Public Law No. 87-615.

The amendments in the 1962 omnibus bill can be grouped into four general categories:

#### 1. REGULATORY AMENDMENTS

Sections 1 through 3 amend the regulatory provisions of the Atomic Energy Act by authorizing the establishment of one or more atomic safety and licensing boards and by modifying the provisions in the act concerning public hearings and review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, as established by the new law, will consist of three members, two of whom shall be technically qualified and one of whom shall be qualified in the conduct of administrative proceedings. As described in the Joint Committee report, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is conceived as a flexible experiment in new administrative law techniques. Its major objectives are to bring technical expertise to bear at the decisionmaking level, and to reduce cumbersome and formalized procedures. The committee report encourages the use of informal procedures by the Board to the maximum extent permitted by the Administrative Procedure Act. The law permits AEC to appoint a panel from which it may select Board members, but the committee report anticipates that the Board will become a permanent institution as the reactor licensing workload of the Commission increases.

The amendment also eliminates the requirement for a mandatory hearing except upon the application for a construction permit for a power or testing facility. In addition, it clarifies the

scope of review required by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, a group of distinguished scientists who assist the Commission as advisers, on a part-time basis.

In summary, the amendments are intended to encourage the application of technical expertise in decisions affecting the licensing of reactors, and to simplify and improve the AEC regulatory process.

#### 2. INDEMNITY AMENDMENTS

Sections 4 through 7 of the new law amend the indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act to cover incidents occurring outside the United States in the AEC contractor program. This coverage is especially needed in the case of contractors in the nuclear submarine and nuclear rocket programs. It is also of vital importance to U.S. contractors engaged in the construction of military reactors in remote locations, such as Greenland and the Antarctica.

The amendments also incorporate limitations and provisions intended to protect the U.S. Treasury against unreasonable judgments in foreign courts.

#### 3. STANDARD AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE

Section 8 incorporates into permanent law a number of boilerplate clauses which have appeared each year in the past as part of the annual AEC authorization bill. These clauses concern advance planning and design, restoration and replacement, and substitutions.

#### 4. MINOR DRAFTING CHANGES

Sections 9 through 12 make minor changes in several sections of the act to correct minor drafting errors or omissions.

#### C. BILL FOR DISPOSAL OF THE LOS ALAMOS COMMUNITY (PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-719)

The Joint Committee in 1962 approved bills to provide for the disposal of the Los Alamos community—H.R. 12718 and S. 3580—in order to terminate Federal Government ownership of facilities and housing in the community and to permit local self-government and private home-ownership.

When the atomic energy projects were started in secrecy during World War II, three communities were established at each of three necessarily remote locations: One at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; another at Richland, Wash.; and a third at Los Alamos, N. Mex. In 1955 Congress enacted the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, providing for the disposal of the Government-owned communities at Oak Ridge and Richland. It was decided not to include the Los Alamos community at that time because of its acute housing shortage and the need for continuing stringent security. In February 1962 the AEC submitted a bill to the Joint Committee to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act to provide for disposal of the Los Alamos community under similar terms and conditions.

Public hearings on the proposed disposal were held by the Subcommittee on Communities at Los Alamos on April 23, 1962. Thirty-eight witnesses testified at the hearing, representing the principal Government agencies involved—AEC and HHFA—as well as public officials and private citizens in the community.

On August 1, 1962, the bills were approved by the Subcommittee on Communities and reported out favorably by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The bill was passed by the Senate on August 8 and by the House of Representatives on September 12, and signed by the President on September 18, 1962, as Public Law No. 87-719.

The bill provides the same general framework for disposal as applied at the Oak Ridge and Richland communities. It authorizes approximately \$8.7 million for necessary plant additions and modifications to be undertaken over the next several years during the period of predisposal and disposal operations. It also authorizes local assistance payments for a period of 10 years after disposal is effective.

In summary, the bill provides the same opportunity for local self-government and home ownership as previously provided to the atomic energy communities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash.

#### II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

##### A. PEACEFUL USES

In accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 1 new agreement, and amendments to 12 existing agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy were submitted to the Joint Committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1962. The new agreement was with Argentina, and the amended agreements are with Brazil, city of West Berlin, the Republic of China, Euratom, France, Greece, Israel, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, and West Germany.

On June 25, 1962, the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation held a public hearing to review the proposed agreement and amendments. Following the hearing, at a committee meeting on June 28, 1962, the Joint Committee waived the remainder of the 30-day period in the case of the amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Israel, since the agreement would have otherwise expired prior to the expiration of the 30-day waiting period.

The new agreement for cooperation with Argentina supersedes a previous agreement. The new agreement provides for the sale or lease, as may be agreed upon, of a net amount of 65 kilograms of U<sup>235</sup>. The old agreement was limited to lesser quantities of material at a lower enrichment.

The amendments to the agreements with the remaining countries, for the most part, extended the terms for an additional 2-year period. New language was also incorporated to facilitate administration of safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency over materials and equipment transferred under the bilateral agreements.

The amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Euratom will permit Euratom to lease, as well as purchase, enriched uranium for power reactors under the United States-Euratom joint reactor program. In addition, the amendment made changes to the existing agreement with respect to the indemnity protection, patents, and the use

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7979

of materials. According to testimony received from representatives of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission, the amendments were consistent with the objectives of the Euratom program and will permit increased cooperation between the United States and the countries of the Western European community in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

## B. MUTUAL DEFENSE

A proposed new agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes was submitted by the President in 1962.

Section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act requires that proposed agreements for cooperation for mutual defense purposes, as distinct from peaceful uses, must lay before the Congress and the Joint Committee for a period of 60 days while Congress is in session, prior to taking effect. Moreover, they may not take effect if the Congress, during the 60-day waiting period, passes a concurrent resolution expressing disapproval.

The proposed agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes was reviewed by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation at executive and public hearings on June 25, 1962. This agreement is essentially the same as agreements which have been concluded since 1959 with a number of other NATO countries. It provides for the transfer of classified information and nonnuclear materials to assist Belgium in the training and operation of its military forces in using and defending against atomic weapons. In accordance with the statute, the agreement does not permit the transfer of any nuclear parts of atomic weapons nor any information to assist another country in the design, development, fabrication, or testing of nuclear weapons.

On June 29, 1962, the Joint Committee filed separate reports to the Senate and House of Representatives on the proposed agreement with Belgium. The report stated that the Joint Committee, after having reviewed the hearings, had no objection to the proposed agreement.

## III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its subcommittees held a total of 94 public and executive hearings. A total number of 200 hours were spent in these hearings. The full committee held 32 executive sessions and 13 public meetings. The subcommittees held 20 executive sessions and 29 public meetings. Some 18 publications, consisting of reports, hearings, and committee prints were printed by the Joint Committee during this 2d session of the 87th Congress.

## A. STATUS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY (SEC. 202)

The Joint Committee held hearings in March on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry." These hearings are held annually in public session pursuant to section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The major focus of this year's hearings was the AEC's goal of achieving economic nuclear power in some areas of the

United States by 1968. Among the subjects covered in the 4 days of hearings were the AEC plutonium buy-back program, private ownership of nuclear fuel, and radioisotopes in industry.

## B. RAW MATERIALS

On June 18 and 19, 1962, the Subcommittee on Raw Materials held public hearings on the AEC uranium procurement program. These hearings were a followup to hearings held by the subcommittee in Moab, Utah, in November 1961.

During the hearings testimony was received from representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and representatives of the uranium industry. The subcommittee heard testimony concerning the increasing trend toward concentration of the industry in a few large corporations, and considered the implications of this trend for the future. The hearings also pointed up the need for a declaration by the Atomic Energy Commission of its uranium procurement policies after 1966.

At the close of the hearings, Subcommittee Chairman ASPINALL stated that the subcommittee would continue to maintain close surveillance over the AEC raw materials program.

## C. INDEMNITY HEARINGS

On April 10 and 11, 1962, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held its annual hearings on atomic energy indemnity and reactor safety. Testimony was received from representatives of the AEC and the reactor and insurance industries.

In addition to reviewing the AEC's regular annual report concerning indemnity and the activities of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, the subcommittee considered several other subjects of current interest in the insurance and indemnity fields.

Testimony was received on the bills, H.R. 9244 and H.R. 10775, introduced by Congressman PRICE, chairman of the subcommittee, to extend Price-Anderson indemnity protection to contractors engaged in activities outside the United States. Legislation on this subject was later incorporated in the 1962 omnibus bill, Public Law No. 87-615—see section I-B above.

The subcommittee also considered insurance and indemnity problems arising out of the transportation of radioactive materials across toll roads, tunnels, and bridges.

Representatives of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards also testified during the hearings on current reactor safety problems and the reactor site criteria recently published by the AEC.

## D. REGULATORY HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Legislation held public hearings on AEC regulatory problems on April 17, 1962. The hearings covered recent developments in the AEC regulatory field and the bills to establish an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board and make other changes in the AEC regulatory process. The substance of these bills were subsequently incorporated in the 1962 omnibus bill, Public Law No. 87-615—see part I-B above.

## E. HEARINGS ON RADIATION STANDARDS AND FALLOUT

The Joint Committee held public hearings June 4-7, 1962, on "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout." These hearings were particularly timely because of increased public concern over the radioactive fallout resulting from the resumption of the nuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union in the preceding fall, followed 6 months later by the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States in the spring of 1962.

The objectives of these hearings were threefold:

First. To update the information previously developed by the Joint Committee during the course of hearings on fallout in 1957 and 1959 and on radiation standards in 1960;

Second. To review Government policies and organizational problems associated with the administration of radiation standards; and

Third. To consider, in layman's terms, the risks involved in exposure to man-made radiation.

After the hearings, the committee prepared a summary analysis which was published in September 1962. In addition to the highlights of the testimony, the summary analysis includes a comparison of the radiation exposures and biological effects from various sources of radiation including medical and dental X-rays, background radiation, and fallout.

The testimony brought out a difference of opinion concerning the applicability of exposure limits established for the peaceful uses of atomic energy to fallout from nuclear weapons testing. Following the hearings, a significant exchange of correspondence occurred between the committee and the Federal Radiation Council and the Public Health Service to obtain clarification on the applicability of available radiation guides to exposures from fallout.

## F. SPACE APPLICATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY

The Joint Committee held a series of hearings on the development of atomic energy for the propulsion of space vehicles and atmospheric missiles as well as the generation of electricity for auxiliary power in space missions.

The first session of these hearings on September 13 covered the Rover nuclear rocket program. In this hearing, testimony was received on the status of the program and plans for flight test of the first nuclear rocket engine. Information was obtained on delays which have been incurred in the program and steps which are planned to accelerate progress in the development of a nuclear rocket engine.

During the second session, the SNAP project—systems for nuclear auxiliary power—was discussed. This program is aimed at the development of nuclear powered electric generators to provide auxiliary power for space vehicles and satellites.

Testimony was received on the performance of the first SNAP unit used to supply electric power for a satellite. This was the Transit satellite which was launched in June of 1961 and which has been performing satisfactorily to date. Testimony was received concerning the

A7980

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 2

resistance of such power supplies to damage by radiation in space, a difficulty which has impaired the performance of solar cells in similar missions. The testimony brought out the need for giving additional consideration to the development and use of nuclear power supplies for future space missions in order to obtain a more reliable power supply.

The final public session of this series of hearings was devoted to the Pluto nuclear ramjet project. This project is aimed at the development of a supersonic nuclear ramjet engine for the propulsion of space vehicles. It is a joint AEC-Air Force development program and is the only project aimed at the development of a nuclear propulsion plant for vehicles in the earth's atmosphere.

The testimony indicated that excellent progress has been realized in the development of the nuclear reactor portion of the system. It was indicated that the associated engine and vehicle development work is 1 to 1½ years behind the development of the nuclear reactor. The testimony made it apparent that delays in the completion of this development program are imminent if the Department of Defense fails to complete its review and approval of the joint AEC-Air Force program for succeeding phases of the project.

## G. DISPOSAL OF THE LOS ALAMOS COMMUNITY

The Subcommittee on Communities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings at Los Alamos, N. Mex., on April 23, 1962, to consider legislation for the disposal of Government-owned properties at the Los Alamos community.

Extensive testimony covered every facet of the proposed termination of Government ownership of the community. In addition, the published record contains an exhaustive collection of financial and descriptive data pertaining to the community.

As noted earlier in this report, these hearings set the stage for further legislative action which resulted in the enactment of the Los Alamos disposal bill.

## H. CONFIRMATION OF PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES

The Senate section of the Joint Committee met in public session on August 14, 1962, to consider the nomination of James T. Ramey and John G. Palfrey to the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Ramey was nominated to serve the remainder of the term of Mr. John S. Graham until June 30, 1963. Mr. Palfrey was nominated to serve a full 5-year term, to expire June 30, 1967.

The Senate section met in executive session to consider the nominations on August 14, 22, and 23. The nominations were reported favorably on August 23 and confirmed by the Senate on August 24, 1962.

## I. U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

On August 2, 1962, the Joint Committee held a public hearing on U.S. policy toward the International Atomic Energy Agency. Special emphasis was given to a report on this subject published May 19, 1962, by an advisory committee to the Department of State.

The committee received testimony from Dr. Henry D. Smyth, U.S. repre-

sentative to the IAEA, who served as chairman of the advisory committee, and from other members of the advisory committee.

In addition, testimony was received from the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, concerning plans by the Department of State and AEC for implementation of the recommendations of the advisory committee's report. Mr. Sterling Cole, former Director General of the IAEA, also testified.

At the outset of the hearings, Chairman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the IAEA has now been in existence for 5 years, and that we approach the juncture where the United States must decide whether the IAEA is to be assigned a major role in U.S. policy for development of nuclear power abroad and application of safeguards, or whether these activities will be carried out primarily through bilateral channels. The testimony indicated that a delegation from India had recently visited the United States seeking assistance for construction of a large atomic powerplant in India. Chairman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the question of whether IAEA safeguards would be applied to such reactors in India would be of crucial importance to the future of the IAEA.

The hearings also covered possible ways in which the United States might indicate further support of the objectives of the IAEA.

## J. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

On June 25, 1962, a public hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation on proposed agreements and amendments to agreements for cooperation with other nations in the atomic energy field. Testimony was received concerning proposed amendments to agreements for peaceful purposes with the city of Berlin and the countries of Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Portugal, South Africa, and Thailand, and with Euratom, and a new agreement with Argentina. In addition, testimony was received concerning a proposed agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes. Following the hearings, on June 29, 1962, the Joint Committee filed reports in the House and Senate stating that it had no objection to the proposed agreement.

## K. PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS FOR ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITIES AT HANFORD NEW PRODUCTION REACTOR

Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1963 Authorization Act, which included provisions authorizing arrangements for the addition of electric generating facilities at the Hanford new production reactor, the Joint Committee held hearings on September 27 to review these proposed arrangements. The committee also reviewed certain determinations which had been made by the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the law.

Testimony was received from each of the contracting parties, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the

Washington Public Power Supply System. Following the hearings, Chairman HOLIFIELD in a letter to the manager of the WPPSS, stated the view of the committee that the proposed arrangements submitted to the committee were "in compliance with the terms and conditions of the law."

## L. FOOD IRRADIATION PROGRAM

The Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held hearings March 6-7, 1962, to review the AEC and Army food irradiation programs.

The hearings were held because of concern over budgetary cutbacks in the AEC program which would have curtailed the fiscal year 1963 effort.

The Army is working under a 6-year program utilizing the high dose or complete sterilization method for the preservation of such foods as meat, pork, and poultry for ultimate Army acceptance and use. It was learned that the Department of the Army expected to obtain approval from the Food and Drug Administration within the near future to begin use of its first irradiated food—bacon.

The AEC program consists of low dose or pasteurization of such foods as fish, fruit, and vegetables for ultimate widespread consumption. Notable successes with fish and fruit were indicated.

Expert witnesses from Government, universities, and other sources testified overwhelmingly in favor of continuance of the program because of the outstanding research results.

Following these hearings the Joint Committee added several items in the AEC authorization bill for the fiscal year 1963 to support the food irradiation program. These projects added by the committee were the marine products demonstration irradiator for fish products and two mobile irradiators which could be transportable to various locations for fruit, vegetable, or fish processing on site.

## IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the hearings described in the previous section of this report, the Joint Committee conducted an extensive number of hearings on classified matters in executive session.

The subject matter of these hearings proved to be as broad as the worldwide defense and security interests of the United States.

## INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS

On January 17 and August 14, 1962, the full committee received intensive briefings on late intelligence developments from Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The meetings were a continuation of the regular practice of semiannual briefings by CIA on vital matters affecting the security of the United States.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING

In the area of nuclear weapons testing, the committee in January reviewed the results of U.S. underground tests with AEC officials. In advance of the resumption of atmospheric testing, the committee also received a detailed briefing from officials of joint task force 8 and its commander, Gen. A. D. Starbird, on planned Pacific test operations.

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7981

After the initial series of atmospheric tests, the committee held further executive hearings at which test results were reviewed with representatives of DOD, AEC, Los Alamos Laboratory, Livermore Laboratory, and Sandia Corp. Among the key officials who testified were Gerald W. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy; Dr. Norris Bradbury; Dr. John Foster, and Mr. S. P. Shwartz, president of Sandia Corp.

## NATO

The problem of nuclear commitments by the United States to NATO continued to be a vital area of committee interest. On March 1, 1962, the committee received an extensive briefing on current and planned U.S. policy with regard to nuclear weapons for NATO. Witnesses from the State Department, DOD, and AEC testified during 2 days of hearings.

Later, in September, the committee met with Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, who had been designated to succeed Gen. Lauris Norstad as supreme Allied commander, Europe. In this meeting the committee had the opportunity of reviewing NATO nuclear weapons arrangements with General Lemnitzer.

## DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

During the course of the year, the committee closely followed the progress of disarmament negotiations. Prior to his departure for Geneva, Ambassador Arthur Dean, U.S. representative to the 18-nation disarmament conference, reviewed proposed U.S. policy positions at Geneva with the joint committee. He was accompanied by representatives of the State Department, AEC, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Upon his return from Geneva, Ambassador Dean, on August 2, 1962, reported to the committee on the progress of negotiations and further U.S. plans in connection with negotiations for a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

## SECURITY

Finally, the committee continued its watchdog role in assuring the adequacy of safeguards to protect restricted data. The Subcommittee on Security held hearings in executive session to review the adequacy of DOD and AEC procedures for the safeguarding of atomic secrets. Included were reviews and analyses of specific security cases. During these hearings, recommendations were made by the committee for improving Defense Department security practices and regulations. Some changes were subsequently adopted by the Department of Defense.

Hon. Clem Miller

## SPEECH

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened at the death of our beloved colleague, CLEM MILLER.

Not only his district in California, but the whole State of California, as well as our great Nation, has lost one of the finest servants in the U.S. Congress.

It seems like only yesterday after we had had the Burns Creek project, which was so vital to my district, defeated on the floor that CLEM MILLER put his comforting arm around my shoulder and said, "We'll get it next year, RALPH." That is the kind of a friend that CLEM MILLER WAS.

I have joined with him on many projects for the benefit of the West. We have fought together for increased money for forest roads and to help the depressed timber industry. His interests extend far beyond his district; he was interested in keeping our Nation strong and prosperous throughout the whole of its boundaries.

I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to his wife, Kathryn, and their five wonderful daughters. They can take great comfort in knowing that their husband and father was not only a great Congressman but also a loyal and devoted American.

**Letter From Robert D. Partridge, Legislative Representative, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Robert Partridge, legislative representative of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, relative to newspaper accounts of an address given in Portland, Oreg., by the association's president, Mr. Clyde Ellis.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC  
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D.C., October 12, 1962.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: An account of the Western States Water and Power Consumers' Conference published in the October 3 edition of the Oregon Journal has just come to my attention. Through an error, the newspaper has attributed remarks to Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which he did not make and which do not reflect his opinions on the subject.

I refer to the following paragraphs contained in a story bylined by Watford Reed: "At the same time, he acknowledged that State and Federal ownership of utilities is 'not in the cards in the United States now' but expressed belief that increased public ownership is possible through municipal ownership and organization of more PUD's."

"We'll be able to get nationwide public ownership only by gradual means," he declared, claiming at the same time that 'the

power companies are combining to kill off the public utility districts."

Mr. Ellis is away from Washington; however I discussed this with him by telephone, and he told me that he did not make these statements at the Western States Water and Power Consumers' Conference, nor has he made such statements at any other time.

Mr. Ellis said he had discussed this newspaper story with Wallace Campbell, director of public affairs for Nationwide Insurance Co., who also spoke at the conference on the same panel. Mr. Campbell believes, as Mr. Ellis does, that the above quoted paragraphs refer to remarks which he (Campbell) made at the conference.

Mr. Ellis feels that this mixup of quotes has caused a most serious situation. It has been seized on by enemies of the rural electrification program and is being used in an attempt to discredit Clyde Ellis and the program. Congressman JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has used it in just such a manner on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Ellis wants it most emphatically understood that neither he nor the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has ever advocated nationwide public ownership of power facilities by any means, gradual or otherwise.

Mr. Ellis feels that the story in the Oregon Journal has been damaging both to him personally and to the rural electrification program which he represented at the Western States Water and Power Consumers' Conference. I hope the Oregon Journal will take action to inform its readers of the true situation in regards to these quotes and do what it can to clear up the misunderstanding.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. PARTRIDGE,  
Legislative Representative.

**Hungary and Soviet Germany: An Eyewitness Report**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Arthur J. May, a veteran of the University of Rochester faculty, has recently returned from 9 months of study and travel in Europe, on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

It was his eighth trip abroad, and while there he presented lectures to learned societies and university groups in Austria and Poland. Dr. May also reported his impressions of Old World countries for the Gannett newspapers.

A pioneer in this country in research and writing on the history of central Europe, Dr. May was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize by the American Historical Association for his "Hapsburg Monarchy." He has written four other books, including a "History of Civilization Since the Mid-17th Century." He is the author, too, of many articles for scholarly journals and other publications, and for leading encyclopedias.

It is against this background that my constituent prepared a number of illuminating press reports on his observations and impressions of today's Europe. I



A7982

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 2

believe they deserve a wide readership, and, under leave previously granted, I include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, May 4, 1962]

HUNGARIANS GRIM, WEARY, RESIGNED  
(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

BUDAPEST.—"When you get to Hungary, I wish you would call on my relatives," a Hungarian refugee from the anti-Communist revolt of 1956 said to me.

"I've talked with them on the telephone, but I'd like to know how they are really living."

"Aren't you afraid that some harm might befall them," I asked, "if an American visited them." "Oh, no," came the answer, "they have lost nearly everything they had, and they don't care what happens now."

Without difficulty I learned from a Budapest travel official how to locate the family and rode there in a couple of congested, antiquated streetcars. It was plain from the furnishings in the cramped apartment that the family had a tradition of refinement and culture.

The very fact that this visit was possible testifies in a way that the strict police surveillance established after the rebellion of 1956 has been relaxed. Three years ago I was refused a visa to spend some time in Hungary, but this year getting one was no problem.

For Americans the fee for a visa has been radically cut since last year. The nub of the matter is that this government of Kremlin puppets welcomes foreigners to get funds to liquidate debts to the Soviet Union and its satellites or to purchase needed goods abroad.

Moving freely in downtown Budapest, I at no time had the slightest suspicion that I was being followed.

On the other hand, the Communist regime is determined to keep its citizens at home. It is next to impossible to secure papers to go abroad, unless the would-be traveler wishes to visit another Communist land, and even that cannot always be arranged.

That the "Iron Curtain" is not a mere figment of the imagination may be vividly seen at heavily guarded frontier points leading from Hungary to Austria.

Dressed in Sunday best on a warm spring day, Budapesters appear better off than their fellows in any other Communist country I have visited in the last 10 years. Clothes have a pleasing variety, and shoes seem stoutly made. But women seldom wear stockings. Cosmetics and costume jewelry are equally rare.

A pair of shoes and two pairs of stockings are the annual quota for an ordinary Hungarian. It takes anywhere from a quarter to a seventh of the average worker's monthly income to buy shoes for a small child. Cotton textiles cost around three times as much as in Austria.

Prices of food on display in stores run roughly the same as in the United States. As in other Communist countries, housing congestion is an everlasting headache. During the last 5 years many big new apartment blocks of small dwellings have gone up, though not nearly enough to meet elementary needs in this growing city of almost 2 million. Apartments in one fancy new building are awarded to top winners in state lotteries.

Men and women beyond 30, say, look weary, grim, harassed, frustrated, resigned. Rarely do you see a smile on a face. But youngsters romp, laugh, or kick a soccer ball around as though theirs was the best of all possible worlds.

[From the Elmira (N.Y.) Star-Gazette, May 9, 1962]

HUNGARIAN CAPITAL CITY OF CONTRASTS—  
BUDAPEST HAS A SPLIT PERSONALITY

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

BUDAPEST.—This capital of the Hungarian People's Republic is a twin city. On one side rise the steep hills of Buda, with fragmentary Roman ruins to remind the traveler that it was once embraced in the great empire. On the other is Pest, a part of the endless plain sweeping eastward. The fast-flowing Danube separates the two sections.

All the connecting bridges were knocked out during the Russian conquest in World War II. With one exception the bridges have been replaced and work is underway to restore the last one.

Hotels along the edge of the Danube were so badly damaged in the savage fighting that most of them have been razed. Their sites serve today as public parks. The massive royal palace also suffered severely and is being reconstructed as the national library.

Many older houses are pockmarked with shellfire from the war period or from the civil struggle of 1956.

On the fashionable streets of Pest smart shops with attractive window displays are fairly numerous. Move off to the side streets in the older area though, and you find them dirty and often reeking with unpleasant odors. Street lighting at night is inadequate.

Quality inns where delicate wine is served attract crowds of patrons. Gypsy orchestras entertain with tunes, some of which are straight from the sidewalks of New York or Vienna.

Blue public buses are solidly built, but streetcars, two or three in a string, have a melancholy, shabby appearance and are scheduled for oblivion.

Rakish tugs chug heroically against the stiff current of the Danube, dragging heavily laden barges. Passenger boats, flaunting the red, green, and white flag of Hungary, are loaded to capacity.

Book stores are well supplied and offer selected works by Western authors. Street signs announce that "Hamlet" and "Romeo and Juliet" will be presented in coming theater attractions. Efforts are being made to revive the classic traditions of the Budapest Opera.

A great deal of space in the newspapers is assigned to sports. An immense stadium, accommodating 96,000 spectators, ranks with the enormous Communist Party headquarters as a new showplace in the Capital. Margaret Island with winding paths, a Japanese garden, boat and tennis clubs, thermal baths and swimming facilities for the densely concentrated population retains its popularity.

Among the great churches of Budapest, Holy St. Stephen's resembles St. Peter's of Rome in appearance. Throngs crowd in to worship and to seek consolation and comfort. Elderly people predominate in the congregation. Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty remains a refugee in the American Legation, as he had been for almost 8 years.

A rather large square bears the name of Roosevelt. Not far away stenciled on a wall is "Cuba si, Yankee non." On the spacious Stalin Square a dull, dumpy plant occupies the space filled by a massive statue of the Soviet dictator until the revolutionary events of 1956. Nicholas Lenin is remembered in the name of the principal boulevard.

Police and soldiers are not conspicuously plentiful, though everyone knows that Soviet infantry and tanks are not far away, ready to suppress ruthlessly any attempt to repeat the fight for freedom of 1956.

Despite incessant press and radio propaganda to the effect that conditions in Hungary are better than in free Europe, some analysts guess that as many as 9 out of 10 adult Hungarians are anti-Communist and cherish a deep sense of alignment with the West.

[From the Gannett newspapers, July 7, 1962]

DRESDEN ART: SLOGANS, PAINTINGS IN CITY  
(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

DRESDEN, EAST GERMANY.—If slogans can make a people healthy, wealthy, and wise, Dresdeners should be the most contented folk on earth.

Emblems and photographs, diagrams and placards—white lettering on a deep red background—are plastered all over. Communist watchwords are even stenciled on the windows of streetcars.

A typical specimen appeals to workmen to "bend every resource to strengthen the German Democratic Republic and peace." "By meeting production targets, win a victory for socialism," reads another. Or "Freedom for the oppressed colonial peoples." And "West German militarism is the mortal enemy of German unity."

Alongside of a picture of the wrinkle-faced, goateed President of the Soviet German regime, Walter Ulbricht, stands the sentence, "Increased work efficiency is the hallmark of the Socialist." Attached to the same billboard are photographs of smiling workers pledging to fulfill their assignments in the state economic plan.

A curious agitation center displays pictures of Communist worthies, past and present, German and foreign, and a photograph of ex-President Dwight D. Eisenhower and ex-Vice President Richard M. Nixon cheerfully chatting with Premier Nikita Khrushchev during the latter's visit to the United States in 1959.

Nearby is a monumental metal globe, which a child can easily turn. Communist states are shown in red, the United States and other free countries in somber black, and neutral lands in yellow. Cuba is being given special attention in the form of an art exhibit, and parading schoolchildren wave banners with "Cuba" written on them.

One theme in the sloganeering tops all others: Peace. Reads one poster, "Peace must be fought for"—and another, "Peace and friendship in the future not only for Germany, but for the whole world."

The accent on peace is peculiarly appropriate in Dresden for this city was terribly mangled in the final phase of World War II. In proportion to its population—then in the vicinity of 700,000—Dresden suffered more extensive destruction than any other German community. After that came the inclusion of the city in the Soviet Russian zone of Germany.

Before the war Dresden prided itself on being not only the most beautiful of German cities, but one of the most attractive in the world. Writers called it the Florence on the Elbe, because it occupies both banks of that river's valley, possessed choice palaces, churches, cultural collections, and boasted fine educational establishments, crowned by a world-famous university of technology.

The chief glory of Dresden was—and yet is—the wonderful Zwinger picture gallery. Tardily in the war period, the Nazis stowed the paintings in castles to the east of Dresden, and removed them to abandoned mines and the like as the Red armies stormed westward. After the war, the Soviets hauled the treasures off to Russia, avowedly to keep them from seizure by avaricious America.

Some invaluable art objects disappeared—stolen or destroyed. Not long ago a priceless vase was discovered in the home of a